



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/596,167	06/02/2006	Jan Van Der Meer	2003P02863WOUS	3102
24737 7590 11/25/2011 PHILIPS INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY & STANDARDS P.O. BOX 3001 BRIARCLIFF MANOR, NY 10510			EXAMINER PHILIPPE, GIMS S	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2485	
			NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			11/25/2011	ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

vera.kublanov@philips.com
debbie.henn@philips.com
marianne.fox@philips.com

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/596,167	Applicant(s) VAN DER MEER ET AL.	
	Examiner GIMS PHILIPPE	Art Unit 2485	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 24 August 2011.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ An election was made by the applicant in response to a restriction requirement set forth during the interview on ____; the restriction requirement and election have been incorporated into this action.
- 4) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 5) ☒ Claim(s) 1,2,5,7 and 9-25 is/are pending in the application.
- 5a) Of the above claim(s) ____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 6) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are allowed.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 1,2,5,7 and 9-25 is/are rejected.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are objected to.
- 9) ☐ Claim(s) ____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 10) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 11) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on ____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. ____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. ____. |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date ____. | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: ____. |

DETAILED ACTION

1. In view of the Appeal brief filed on August 24, 2011, PROSECUTION IS
HEREBY REOPENED. New grounds of rejection are set forth below.

To avoid abandonment of the application, appellant must exercise one of the following
two options:

(1) file a reply under 37 CFR 1.111 (if this Office action is non-final) or a reply under 37
CFR 1.113 (if this Office action is final); or,

(2) initiate a new appeal by filing a notice of appeal under 37 CFR 41.31 followed by an
appeal brief under 37 CFR 41.37. The previously paid notice of appeal fee and appeal
brief fee can be applied to the new appeal. If, however, the appeal fees set forth in 37
CFR 41.20 have been increased since they were previously paid, then appellant must
pay the difference between the increased fees and the amount previously paid.

A Supervisory Patent Examiner (SPE) has approved of reopening prosecution by
signing below:

/Jayanti K Patel/

Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2485

November 18, 2011

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claims 1-2, 5, 7, 11, 14-16, and 18-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rose (US Patent no. 6,731,811) in view of Ramprashad (US Patent no. 7,899,059).

Regarding claims 1, 5 and 19, Rose discloses a method for providing heterogeneous layered video support comprising constructing signaling information defining how at least two layers are to be combined at a decoder (See Rose col. 3, lines 50-57, col. 5, lines 15-37), and transmitting the signaling information along with the at least two layers in a transport stream to the decoder (See Rose col. 6, lines 19-36).

It is noted that although Rose provides a signaling information constructed as parameters (See Rose col. 5, lines 17-44), it is silent about the plurality of parameter lists defining a unique quality of service of the transport stream as specified in the claims.

However, Ramprashad discloses a method for providing video support wherein each of the plurality of parameter lists define a unique quality of service of the transport stream (See Ramprashad col. 4, lines 45-56, col. 5, lines 18-28 and col. 6, lines 2-7).

Therefore, it is considered obvious that one skilled in the art at the of the invention, having Rose and Ramprashad before him/her, would recognize the advantage to modify Rose' signaling information step by incorporating Ramprashad's teachings wherein each of the plurality of parameter lists define a unique quality of service of the transport stream. The motivation for performing such a modification in Rose is to be able to adapt the transmission of a media stream to fluctuating channel condition by applying quality of service parameter sets/lists as taught by Ramprashad (See Ramprashad col. 2, lines 8-15, and col. 5, lines 18-28).

As per claims 2, 18 and 20, most of the limitations of these claims have been noted in the above rejection of claims 1 and 19. In addition, Rose further proposes an MPEG-2 transport stream (See col. 1, lines 19-25).

As per claims 14-16, most of the limitations of these claims have been noted in the above rejection of claims 1 and 6. The applicant should note that the signaling information will inherently contains an identifier of the reference layer (See col. 8, lines 28-40).

Art Unit: 2485

As per claims and 7, most of the limitations of this claim have been noted in the above rejection of claim 1. In addition, Rose further discloses constructing signaling information (See col. 5, lines 25-37).

As per claim 11, Rose further provides signaling information wherein one of the parameter values defines, for a corresponding layer, a video stream encoding type (See col. 7, lines 10-25).

4. Claims 9-10 and 12-13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rose (US Patent no. 6,731,811) in view of Ramprashad (US Patent no. 7,899,059) as applied to claim 5 above, and further in view of Haskell et al. (US Patent no. 5742343).

Regarding claims 9-10 and 12-13, most of the limitations of these claims have been noted in the above rejection of claim 5.

It is noted that the combination of Rose and Ramprashad is silent about defining horizontal and vertical FIR coefficients for a filtering operation as specified.

However, Haskell provides a method for providing heterogeneous layered video including defining horizontal and vertical FIR coefficients for a filtering operation (See Haskell col. 5, lines 1-7, col. 7, lines 63-67, col. 8, lines 1-11).

Therefore, it is considered obvious that one skilled in the art at the time of the invention would recognize the advantage of modifying the layering of the combination of

Art Unit: 2485

Rose and Ramprashad by incorporating Haskell's teachings defining horizontal and vertical FIR coefficients for a filtering operation. The motivation for performing such a modification in the proposed combination of Rose and Ramprashad is to form combined and filtered base layer and enhancement layer where noise has been reduced.

5. Claims 17 and 21-25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rose (US Patent no. 6,731,811) in view Ramprashad (US Patent no. 7,899,059) as applied to claims 1 and 19 above, and further in view of Harrell et al. (US Patent no. 7274661).

Regarding claims 21-25, most of the limitations of these claims have been noted in the above rejection of claims 1 and 19.

It is noted that the combination of Rose and Ramprashad is silent about transmitting signal over the transport stream using an Internet Protocol stream to the decoder while the transmission session is performed either in-band or out-of-band as specified in the claims.

However, Harrell provides a method for providing layered video support including transmitting the layers (BS ES) over Internet Protocol using real-time transport protocol while the transmission session is performed either in-band or out-of-band (See Harrell col. 4, lines 23-37).

Therefore, it is considered obvious that one skilled in the art at the time of the invention would recognize the advantage of modifying the transmission step of the

Art Unit: 2485

combination Rose and Ramprashad of the method for providing layered video support by incorporating Harrell's teaching where layered video support includes transmitting the layers (BS ES) over Internet Protocol using real-time transport protocol in the transmission session. The motivation for performing such a modification in the combination of Rose and Ramprashad is to provide uninterrupted streaming media over IP networks in order to guarantee Quality of Service as taught by Harrell (See Harrell col. 4, lines 23-37).

As per claim 17, most of the limitations of this claim have been noted in the above rejection of claim 5.

It is noted that the combination of Rose and Ramprashad is silent about providing heterogeneous layered video wherein one of the parameters defines whether a corresponding layer contains one of an interlaced or progressive stream.

However, Harrell provides a method for providing layered video support wherein one of the parameters defines whether a corresponding layer contains one of an interlaced or progressive stream (See Harrell col. 5, lines 1-7 and col. 6, lines 2-16).

Therefore, it is considered obvious that one skilled in the art at the time of the invention would recognize the advantage of modifying Rose's layering of the proposed combination by incorporating Harrell's step wherein one of the parameters defines whether a corresponding layer contains one of an interlaced or progressive stream. The motivation for performing such a modification in Rose and Ramprashad is to

Art Unit: 2485

prevent aliasing and maintain resolution as taught by Harrell in col. 1, lines 66-67 and col. 2, lines 1-6.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to GIMS PHILIPPE whose telephone number is (571)272-7336. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F (10:30-7:00).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Jay Patel can be reached on (571) 272-2988. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Gims S Philippe
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 2485

/G. P./
/Gims S Philippe/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2485

Application/Control Number: 10/596,167
Art Unit: 2485

Page 9